

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

YI SUN,

Plaintiff,

-v.-

HUGH H. MO; TSAI CHUNG CHAO;  
MAYOR ERIC LEROY ADAMS; THE LAW  
FIRM OF HUGH H. MO, P.C.; LI DA SUN;  
THE TOP ASIAN UNIFORMED NYPD  
OFFICERS, WHO ARE MEMBERS OF  
THE NYPD ASIAN-AMERICAN POLICE  
EXECUTIVES COUNCIL, AAPEX;  
NATURO-MEDICAL HEALTH CARE, P.C.;  
THE CITY OF NEW YORK; DET. STEVEN  
MATTHEWS; DET. BRYAN TROCKEL;  
DET. BRUNO VIDAL; SAM TSANG;  
DETECTIVE OR SUPERVISOR IN 72  
PRECINCT; and LIEUTENANT TIMOTHY  
CAI,

Defendants.

24 Civ. 3630 (KPF)

**ORDER**

KATHERINE POLK FAILLA, District Judge:

Plaintiff Yi Sun (“Plaintiff” or “Ms. Sun”), who is appearing *pro se*, filed a motion to stay the Court’s December 26, 2024 Order. (Dkt. #68). The December 26, 2024 Order dismissed the action due to Ms. Sun’s continued failure to comply with Court orders. (Dkt. #67).

As described in that Order, in September 2024, Defendant City of New York (the “City”) requested that the Court compel Plaintiff to provide the City with a § 160.50 unsealing release, which was necessary in order for the City to conduct its investigation into Plaintiff’s allegations, and copies of which had been sent to Plaintiff in March, April, July, and September 2024. (*Id.* at 1-2).

The Court repeatedly ordered Ms. Sun to provide the executed release to the City, so that the case could proceed. (Dkt. #28, 50, 60). The Court cautioned Ms. Sun that continued failure to comply with the Court's orders would result in sanctions, including dismissal of the case. (Dkt. #50, 60). Ms. Sun did not at any point represent to the Court why she would not provide the release or that she needed an extension of time to do so and ultimately did not provide the release. Having attempted to implement less drastic sanctions to no avail, the Court dismissed the case. (Dkt. #67).

Plaintiff now asks that the Order dismissing the case be stayed, and alleges that the Court issued the "self-serving" Order, because the Court is prejudiced against Ms. Sun. (Dkt. #68 at 2). These allegations are similar to those made against the Court in Ms. Sun's motions for recusal. (See Dkt. #21, 42). But, as in those motions for recusal, Ms. Sun has provided no reasoning to support her claim that this Court is prejudiced against Plaintiff. Indeed, the Court has no such personal bias or prejudice against Ms. Sun and dismissed the action because of Ms. Sun's repeated failure to comply with Court orders that were necessary to the continued prosecution of the case. Accordingly, the Court DENIES Ms. Sun's motion. The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff at her address of record.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 28, 2025  
New York, New York



---

KATHERINE POLK FAILLA  
United States District Judge